



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REPORTS.

GERMANIA. Vierteljahrsschrift für deutsche Alterthumskunde. Herausgegeben von Karl Bartsch. Wien, 1882.

Soon after the publication of P. Erasmus Müller's Sagabibliothek, it was admitted by most scholars that the Thidrekssaga was indebted to a mixing of several sagas for its origin, some of them but loosely joined to the central figure, Thidrek of Bern, and in this respect none more so than the story of the jarls Iron and Apollonius.

Friedrich Neumann now opens the first number with an article in which he proposes to show that this story consists of two separate sagas blended into one in the Thidrekssaga. Furthermore, to reproduce as nearly as possible according to context their original form, trace the connection of the Apolloniussaga with the Kudrunsaga and explain the origin of chapters 245-75 in the Thidrekssaga. The article brings to bear a good deal of the light of common sense upon the subject, and the conclusions arrived at by Neumann, we think, are sound. The separate sagas of Iron and Apollonius were rather unskillfully united by the writer of chapters 245-75. The two jarls were made brothers, and to connect them with the heroes of the Thidrekssaga the names of Attila, Dietrich, Ermanrich and others were arbitrarily introduced. As regards the points of similarity between the Apolloniussaga and the Kudrun, we must confess that they are often as striking as are found in other sagas quoted by editors of the Kudrun, "und selbst wenn wir bei dem Mühlenhoffschen Kudrun text schwören sollten," which we do not, having always looked upon this reading as an anthology of 'äventiuren' from the epic which, according to the taste of Mühlenhoff, were the most beautiful.

C. Marold continues his article "Kritische Untersuchungen über den Einfluss des Latein. auf die Gothische Bibel übersetzung (cf. American Journal of Philology, Vol. II, 7), and C. Mogk prints eleven fragments of one of the many versions belonging to Rudolf v. Ems' "Weltchronik." The original leaves (twelve) are in the Royal Library in Kopenhagen, and according to Edzardi were found attached to the covers of some law books in 1862 by assistant librarian Weeke. They seem to have been written about 1300, and represent a new phase of that favorite work of the middle ages.

Fedor Bech in a brief paper draws attention to a verb *dougen, tougen*, occurring with Middle German writers. The places where it is found are either not mentioned by Lexer in his M. H. G. Wörterbuch, or, following W. Grimm's and Pfeiffer's explanation of the word, placed with the wrong verb. Earliest and most frequently it is found in writings that originated in the west of Middle Germany.

Ich dougen des scharpfen swerdes slach (25, 7)

Owê wat wir dougen (29, 6).—*Marienlegenden*, ed. W. Grimm.

Grimm in a note says *dougen* = verborgen tragen, verheimlichen, and Lexer accordingly places it under *tougen* = verheimlichen, with which it has nothing to do, but evidently belongs to the Low German *dögen* = leiden, erdulden (cf. Schiller-Lübben, M. N. D. Wörterbuch, I 532). Pfeiffer in his glossary to Nicolaus v. Jeroschin (east of Middle Germany) identified *dougen* with *douwen* = verdauen, and Lexer notes *dougen* as a secondary form of *döuwen*, Vol. I, 455 (cf. Weinhold Gramm. §206, Müller-Zarncke M. N. D. Wörterbuch, I 386a, Schade Altd. Wörterbuch, p. 97). On p. 1480, Vol. II, Lexer only has the noun *toufe* as a stf. In the "Wartburgkrieg," 116, 6 ed. Simrock, occurs *mit der toufen*, and in the "Parzival," 43, 6, *starb er äne toufen sît* (cf. Lexer Nachträge, 375, *toufen* stn.). Bech suggests a nominative *toufene*, *toufen*, as a secondary form of *toufe* (cf. Grimm Gram. 2, 171, Weinhold Gram. § 256).

Vernaleken furnishes a parallel to Grimm's fable "Das wasser des Lebens." This version of the ancient and popular myth which he gathered in the Schratenthal in Lower Austria differs in the main but little from Grimm's story.

Reinhold Bechstein reviews Alwin Schultz's work "Das höfische Leben zur Zeit der Minnesänger," I Vol., Leipzig, 1879. In the course of his eulogy on the book he says that he cannot help being in a measure vexed that an art historian should have taken the initiative in a matter which so entirely belongs to philology. But when he looks about among his fellow-philologists he can not find one—Weinhold excepted—who would be able to write a book like this one. This is a lamentable fact in the midst of a science that otherwise does such good work. "Thus it cannot remain," he exclaims, "Wir müssen den realien fortan einen grösseren einfluss einräumen. Die realien müssen unsere kritischen und hermeneutischen, selbst unsere grammatischen studien durchdringen und befruchten, sonst bleiben wir im leblosen krame stecken."

The Book Notices of the first number close with favorable criticisms by K. J. Schröer and Felix Liebrecht of Amelie Sohr's book "Heinrich Rückert in seinem Leben und Wirken," Weimar, 1880, and Eva Wigström's (Ave) Folk-digtning, samlad och upptecknad i Skåne, Köbenhavn, 1880.

The Miscellany contains a rather spirited reply from G. Milchsack to Anton Schönbach's adverse criticism (Anzeiger f. d. Alt. 7, 1881) of M.'s edition of the Heidelberg Passion play and two fragments (Passional and Konrad's Trojanerkrieg) by Bartsch.

R. Springer contributes the first article of the second number "Die legende vom Judenknaben." Of the popular legend of the Jewish boy who, with his Christian playmates, goes to communion and is punished for it by his father by being thrown into the flames, but saved from death by the Virgin, we possess not less than 5 Greek, 14 Latin and 8 French texts (cf. Bibliotheca normannica, ed. Suchier, Vol. II, Halle, 1879). Besides the versions in Spanish, Arabic, etc., we have two in German, "Das Jüdel," published by Hahn (poems of the 12th and 13th centuries) and Mühlhoff (Altdeutsche Sprachproben), and "Der Judenknabe," printed by F. Pfeiffer (Marienlegenden), which differ materially in the treatment of the legend from that in the other languages. Sprenger gives a critical text of the "Jüdel," places it with the classic period of M. H. G., the 12th century (cf. Wackernagel Lit., p. 205), and makes Konrad v. Heimesfurt the author. He considers it the older version upon which the younger "Der Judenknabe" was partly based.

From Sprenger's text:

hende winden unde klagen
unt weinen was dâ wider strît
unz nâhen ze complête zit
331. daz man dâ *tavelte* in der stat.

we note the following correction for Müller-Zarncke M. H. D. Wörterbuch, Lexer Handwörterbuch, and Weigand Deutsches Wörterbuch. Müller, Vol. III, 19 *tavelen* swv. = tafel halten, speisen (quotes v. 331 above). Lexer, II, 1410 has additional explanations of the word, among them "durch Anschlagen an eine hölzerne Tafel ein Zeichen geben (statt des Läutens)," cf. *tävern*, Schmeller, I 587. This meaning should be taken in v. 331. On holy Friday no bell is rung in Catholic countries, but the sign to begin service is given by knocking on a wooden tablet. *Tafeln* = speisen is New-German, emend. Weigand II³ 871.

F. Pfaff supplies a Middle German fragment (240 verses in the city archives, Frankfurt a. M.) of Reinbot's Georg, to which Bartsch adds a list of the known MSS of that poem, and K. G. Andresen sends an almost exhaustive list of family names derived from *diet*, *thiuda*.

Fedor Bech "Zum Wortschatz des Chemnitzer Urkundenbuchs." From the large collection of words we note Grimm, D. W., II 426 *brueling* = frischling, wie es in den Brül (= wiese) getrieben wird; Sanders, D. W., I 228 *brueling* from *bruch* = sumpf; Bech connects it with *brühen*, Low German *brojen* (Schiller-Lübben, I 427^b). *Bechen swîn*, i. e. das zu Speck und Schinken bestimmte Schwein, incorrectly printed in Lexer's Handwörterbuch *beckenswîn* and translated by *bäckerschwein* (Nachträge, 46), cf. *bachen* in Lexer. *Derjenige*, pronoun, according to Grimm and Weigand not before the 16th century; Bech finds it in the 15th. *Durchaus*, adverb, Grimm, Wörterbuch, II 1583, not before the 16th century; Bech quotes it from the 15th. *Hern*, Grimm in W. III 52 says "es ist ein unverstand schon dem nominativ ein obliques *n* (h)ehrn, (h)ehren beizusetzen wie Bürger thut:

hierauf sprang (h)ehren Loth herbei
mit brausen und mit schnarchen."

Bech shows this usage in documents of the 15th century (cf. Sanders, I 344a). B. continues with two minor communications "Vom Eichhorn als Wildpret," and "Das wort *tinne*." The first article furnishes Alwin Schulz, the writer of "Das höfische leben zur zeit der Minnesänger," with more material to enlarge in the next edition of his work, the list of the different kinds of game used at the table of prince and knight during the middle ages. The second communication maintains his reading *tinne* = schläfe, instead of *täme* = daumen, in F. Pfeiffer's "Arzneibüchern," II 4, as defended by Sprenger. The Kornenburg fragment which Blass published in the Germania (26, 380) seems to confirm *tinne* as the proper word.

Most mediaeval epics have received for years a close and scholarly attention. This attention, however, has not been uniformly spread over the whole field; favorites like the Nibelunge nôt and Kudrun have received more than their

fair share, other less conspicuous but perhaps as much in want of elucidation have certainly received less. It has struck us as remarkable, considering the connection of the Ortnit-Wolfdietrichsage with so many epics, how small a part of the work of philologists has been devoted to it. Friedrich Neumann in a paper, "Die Entwicklung der Ortnitdichtung und der Ortnitsage," contributes a searching analysis of the poem, which gives promise that the subject will be dealt with more frequently. He concludes that the Ortnit-Wolfdietrichsage originated in the combining of two independent subjects, Ortnit the dragon-slayer being a different personage from Ortnit "der Riuze" who sails beyond the sea. Soon after the taking of Tyrus in the year 1124 a new version appears that makes Suders the capital of the enemy, and through the influence of the battles round Mons Tabor in 1217 a later poet substitutes Muntabûre for Suders, placing Alberich, heretofore of little import, as the central figure. The poet of our text mixes two versions, the older having Suders as the object of the expedition, the younger, Muntabûre. He tries to disguise the contradictions incident to this process, but does not succeed.

F. Vetter sends some minor communications, and Bartsch prints five folksongs of the XV century.

Felix Liebrecht pronounces favorably upon *Les littératures populaires de toutes les nations*: Tom I. *Littérature orale de la Haute Bretagne*, par Paul Sébillot, Paris, 1881; and Hermann Fischer reviews H. Paul's "Zur Nibelungenfrage," Halle, 1877, reprinted in Paul und Braune's *Beiträge*, Vol. III.

A folksong of the time of the Thirty Years' War on "Gustav Adolf's Tod," sent by F. Pfaff, and a communication from Bartsch regarding the *ἀπαρξ λεγόμενα* in the *Nibelungen* printed by B. Symons in his review in *Literaturblatt* No. 1, 1882, of B.'s *Nibelungen Wörterbuch*, close the second number.

In an announcement of W. H. Carpenter's "Grundriss der neuisländischen Grammatik," Leipzig, 1881, in the *Literaturblatt für germ. und roman. Philologie*, 1881, 2, Finnur Jonsson sharply criticised the glossary and reading matter accompanying the work (cf. *Amer. Journal of Philology*, II 5), and Byörn Magnussen Olsen now follows with an article, "Zur neuisländischen Grammatik," first in third number, in which he violently attacks the "Laut und Flexionslehre" of Carpenter's grammar. Olsen seems to us to have dealt with the book somewhat in a spirit of *revanche*. "Neben der allgemeinen (wissenschaftlichen) habe ich auch eine besondere persönliche Aufforderung, gegen dieses werk einspruch zu erheben" (des Pudels kern?). The book was written conjointly in Reykjavik, Iceland, by Olsen and Carpenter, but finally augmented and published in Germany by the latter. Olsen finds the "Flexionslehre"—the outlines of which he furnished entirely—intentionally changed and interpolated by awkward additions, and his communications were in many instances misunderstood or not understood at all by Carpenter. The sketch of the history of the language in the introduction of the work O. pronounces "aus ihrem zusammenhange losgerissene Literaturnotizen" which the author mainly copied from Vigfusson's Icelandic reader and Möbius' essay "Über die altnordische Sprache." A "Lautlehre," originally not intended for the work, was added by the author. It offers little of new matter, O. continues, but many errors, and as a rule the author plagiarises Gislason and Wimmer, whom he, however,

often misunderstands. "Sehr zu bedauern ist, dass der erste versuch, eine wirkliche neuisländische Grammatik zu schreiben, so ärmlich ausgefallen ist." But we pass from these personal compliments. That Carpenter's book needs corrections is acknowledged, we presume, by himself, and for this an unbiased, disinterested criticism is wanted. Olsen does not give it to us. With the knowledge of the importance to philology of a grammar of the living Icelandic tongue so long existing, it seems odd that we should so recently have only our first book on the subject.

A minor communication from R. Sprenger, "Alber von Regensburg und die Eneide," seems to establish the fact that Alber was acquainted with Veldecke's Eneide and the description of hell in that epic. A comparison of quoted passages from Alber's Tundalus and the Eneide shows a remarkable resemblance. We note the expression "Ein ovele nâgebûr," Eneide 3238; "Ein übel nâchgebûre," Kudrun, Strophe 650, 4. Sprenger thinks the Eneide probably prompted the saying in the Kudrun (cf. Martin, Kudrun).

The only text heretofore known of the poem "Wigamur" was the Wolfenbüttel MS of the end of the 16th century. Lately the Salzburg and Munich fragments were discovered. F. Keinz prints the Munich text and assigns it to the middle of the 13th century, not long after the writing of the original. This completes the publication of the known Wigamur MSS. The Wolfenbüttel MS was published by Büsching in the Deutsche Gedichte des Mittelalters, and the Salzburg fragments by R. M. Werner in the Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum, XXIII 100.

Edzardi, in an article, "Fensalir und Vegtamskviða," dissents from S. Bugge's explanation of the word *meyjar* in the Vegtkv. 12, 5-8:

hverjar 'ru þær meýjar,
er at muni gráta, etc.

Bugge finds the key in the Homeric *κοῦραι ἄλγιοι γέροντος*—the mermaids (*meyjar*) lament the death of Achilles—Baldur being Achilles. Edzardi discourages the tendency of explaining the northern sagas by Greek myths, as by such a process they are hardly ever reasoned out to any satisfactory issue. They may generally be interpreted much more simply from Germanic mythology. (We agree with E.) Edzardi makes *meyjar* to refer to Frigga's eyes, and illustrates this from the Wodan-Baldr myth. Corresponding to the passage in the Vegtkv. the Vsp. 34, 5 has:

"en Frigg um grét
i *Fensolum*
vá Valhallar."

Bugge explains *fensalir* = meersäle (hafsalir). Frigg i Fensolum = the nereide Thetis beneath the ocean. Edzardi here considers *fen* = teich, sumpf, and *fensalir* connected with the popular belief that certain swamps and ponds were the entrances to the abode of Holda (Frigga), the lower world.

C. M. Blass prints "Deutsche Randbemerkungen" of the 13th century, found with a Psalter at present in the city archives of Kornenburg, and Bartsch and F. Keinz supply similar matter from Erlangen and Munich libraries.

K. Nerger, "Zu Hartmann's Iwein," maintains that the reading of vv. 3473, 74:

"unz si in allenthalven streich
darzuo si vil stille sweich,"

as it is given by all MSS of that epic, might be left unaltered notwithstanding the weighty authorities that proposed emendation. Bennecke and Lachmann in their Iwein strike out the verses with the remark "als unecht zu verwerfen." Bechstein derives the word *sweich* from *swichen* = *entweichen*, and not from *swigen* = *schweigen* (cf. Amer. Journ. of Philology III 10, p. 255). The reasons for rejection or emendation were found in the counting of verses which gives to Iwein 272×30 verses, in the word *sweich* for *sweic*, and in the want of proper sense. The first reason has since been considered fallacious; and as to the second, Weinhold's Allem. Gram. and Paul's Untersuchungen have shown that a change of the stem *g* to *ch* in the auslaut was not an extraordinary occurrence with the countrymen of Hartmann. As regards the third reason for correcting the verses, Nerger would also leave them untouched, and gives the following explanation of Hartmann's *sweich*. It is well known that there were two kinds of cures of disease by supernatural means. One—die weisse Zauberei—employed loud prayers and exhortations; the other—die Schwarze—of a demoniac origin, used mysterious signs and knew no stricter observance than absolute silence (*vil stille swigen*). The question what kind of "zauberei" was employed in curing Iwein is answered by passages in Hartmann's Erec, vv. 5158–5241 (Feimurgan and the "tiuvel ir geselle").

Bartsch furnishes "Bruchstücke von Konrads Trojanerkriege" (13th and 15th century) and "Kritische Glossen zu einem unkritischen texte." This last paper answers Lichtenstein's remarks in the Zeitsch. f. d. Alth. 26, 1, on the forthcoming edition of "Eilhart" by Bartsch. (Four years ago Bartsch criticised Lichtenstein's edition.) The worthy editor of the Germania seems to have taken, so to speak, an absolute measure of Lichtenstein, and is good enough to give him a "frank and full opinion" of his ability as a philologist and critic. He hopes, however, that before the appearance of his "Eilhart" L. will have learned some more Grammar, metrik and critical method.

Vernaleken sends three "Volksagen aus Oesterreich," and R. Sprenger examines some verses of Konrad v. Fussesbrunnen's "Kindheit Iesu," which he thinks are probably imitations of passages in Veldecke's Eneide, Ulrich v. Zazikhofen's Lanzelet and Gotfried's Tristan. In a note on v. 7180 in Hartmann's Erec, Sprenger suggests a different explanation of the word *hasenwinden*, *hasenwint*, heretofore translated by "Windhund z. Jagen der Hasen." The connection with the other verses rather points to *winden* = a kind of weapon used in hunting hares, and this view seems to be supported by a passage from Gerhard v. Minden:

"ôk komet jegere al her getreket
mit *winden*, panden und mit hunden."

Cf. Schiller-Lübben M. N. D. Wörtb. V, 724.

In a note on "Hartmann's 2 Büchlein," Sprenger finds the verses 670, 71 almost reproduced by Konrad Fussesbrunnen in his "Kindheit Iesu" 1642.

From it he draws the inference that Hartmann, and not one of his later imitators, really was the writer of the "2 Bûchlein." The time which is assigned to the origin of Konrad's poem contradicts the opinion which would place the authorship of the "2 Bûchlein" to another and later writer. S. thinks the change of the word *gewant* (v. 1681) to *gelant* (Lachmann) unnecessary, since the former perfectly suits the sense of the passage.

Felix Liebrecht reviews the 3d Vol. of Eugène Rolland's *Faune populaire de la France*, Paris, 1881, and the Miscellany contains a contribution from A. Lübken, "Zum Sachsenspiegel," in which he questions the assertion of Richard Schröder (No. 9 *Literaturblatt f. germ. u. roman. Philolog.*, 1880) "der text des Oldenburger Codex sei die niederdeutsche rückübersetzung eines hochdeutschen textes."

The fourth number opens with an article of Fedor Bech, "Zu dem Pariser Tagezeiten," in which he points out the passages in the work that were directly modeled after *Frauenlob*; and Edzardi has "Kleine Beiträge zur Geschichte und Erklärung der Eddalieder." In the 23d and 24th Vols. of the *Germania* the *Gripisspá* was treated by Edzardi. A further examination of the text has convinced him that in one place—Strophes 33-44 (Hilderbrand)—it is even more incomplete and perplexing than was generally supposed. E. prints the strophes in the order which he considers the original.

E. Steffenhagen furnishes a "Kieler Bruchstück aus Berthold's von Halle Demantin." The writing proves it to be of the 14th century, and the context corresponds to the verses 1287-1438 of Bartsch's complete edition.

Ferdinand Vetter follows with some minor communications, and C. v. Herdenberg prints a paper MS of the 15th century, "Die vier Temperamente."

A series of remarks and questions made by Otto Behagel, which, he says, were suggested to him by his edition of the "Heliand," will prove of great value for any future edition and the study of that work.

R. Sprenger reads *Erec*, 2265:

swaz aber im des gebrast
(daz meinde daz er was dâ gast:
 sîn lant was im verre),
 Artûs der herre
 gap im swaz er vor sprach.

Meinen has here the meaning of *to cause*. Thus it is also used by K. v. Heimesfurt, "Urstende," 113, 41:

"daz er des êrsten genas (mit dem tode fûrs erste verschont blieb)
 daz meinde deiz was spâte."

A list of recent publications in the field of Germanic philology by the editor, Karl Bartsch; J. H. Gallée, of Utrecht; K. Gislason, of Copenhagen; K. F. Sodervall, of Lund, and an index to Vols. XXV-VII of the *Germania*, close the fourth number.

C. F. RADDATZ.

HERMES. 1882.

No. I.

E. Fabricius, of Strassburg, writes The Building-contract of Delos, C. I. G. 2266. This inscription is one of those first published by Chandler in 1763, and is now preserved in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford. Recently there were found at Lebadea and Tegea important inscriptions dealing with kindred matters. Thus many new points of analogy have become available, and Fabricius has been prompted to discuss the Delian inscription anew. The time of the inscription may be gathered from the form of the letters and from other data; Fabricius assigns it to the latter part of the third century B. C., when Delos enjoyed autonomy.

The contract relates to the building of the floor of the temple of Apollo. The successful bidder for the contract, his bondsmen and the official witnesses to the contract are given, these latter being partly officials (the clerk of the council, the clerk of the *ἱεροποιοί* and of the market-masters), and partly private persons. This contract is preceded by a general outline of the conditions of the contract *per se* with appended legal points. Any unsuccessful bidder could bring a *δίκη ψεύδους* against the actual contractor, *i. e.* accuse him of malfeasance in the execution, fraud, etc. It seems that the compensation agreed upon was given to the contractor (*ἐργῶνς*) in two instalments, ten per cent. being held back until the entire work was concluded. The commissioners, if they failed to make their payments on the date agreed upon, were bound to pay an *ἐπιφορά*, and the contractor likewise had to pay a fine for any tardiness. In accepting the completed work the commissioners were aided by the *ἀρχιτέκτων* who acted as their professional counsel and official expert.

C. Galland discusses interpolations in Arcadius, a late grammarian who drew largely on Herodian.

W. Dittenberger contributes notes on Greek noun-inflexion. The form *ἱππέης* occurs in an Attic inscription of 394 B. C. This form D. believes to be the forerunner of *ἱππῆς*, denying the claim that *ἱππῆς* or *ἱππῆες* are the prior forms, and quoting analogous forms from inscriptions.

Mommsen discusses Die untergegangenen Ortschaften in Latium, basing his paper on Pliny, N. H. III 5, 68, 69. This list of communities mostly refers to places which lost their existence as civil corporations before the beginning of the imperial era; a few were razed by Sulla. Most of them were of the *Prisci Latini*. According to Mommsen, Pliny's information came from the old Roman *Annales*, but not directly; probably he derived it through Varro's *Antiquitates humanae*. The list as edited by Mommsen includes Ameriola, Amitinum, Antemnae, Caenina, Cameria, Collatia, Corniculum, Crustumium, Ficana, Medullium, Politorium, Pometium, Satricum, Scaptia, Tellena, Tifata.

Hinrichs: The Episode of Chryseis in Homer. The author of this somewhat diffuse paper is of opinion that modern Homer-criticism is unduly barren, and his present effort is to relieve this unproductiveness. According to Hinrichs, the criticism of artistic and chronological points has run its complete course. Much, however, he thinks may still be done by verbal analysis. The return of Chryseis in A, according to Hinrichs, is the work of a wretched "Flickmeister."

This wooden person went to work in a manner worthy of a lazy and mechanical schoolboy; culling a phrase here and two words there, a couple of lines plundered from γ , some phrases and general situations filched outright from the hymn to the Pythian Apollo, also from β , ϑ , τ , and from more than a dozen different books of the Iliad. Hinrichs professes himself a disciple of Lachmann. That critic, indeed, considered this episode as "sehr geschickt," and "an sich vortrefflich," but Lachmann left much laborious detail to later workers. The whole paper seems to the reporter nebulous and unsatisfactory.

E. Petersen (Prague): Der Streit der Goetter (Athena and Poseidon) um Athen, discusses anew the St. Petersburg vase, and pronounces and explains his dissent from Robert's interpretation of it (Hermes, 1881, p. 60 sqq.).

C. Robert: Die angebliche Pyrrhosbüste der Uffizien und die iconographischen Publicationen des 16ten Jahrhunderts. In this archaeological discussion Robert produces some interesting notes which throw considerable light upon the later renaissance in Italy. The enthusiastic desire to identify portrait busts, Hermae, etc., with great men of old led to much falsification of inscriptions on the part of connoisseurs, collectors, authors and publishers. This became evident by inconsistency in successive publications of the same art-objects, by gross blunders of the falsifiers, and by covert admissions of authors and publishers. The Anthology very generally served as the source from which were drawn the epigrams put on bases.

F. Blass: Neue Papyrus-fragmente im Aegyptischen Museum zu Berlin. B. publishes and comments upon the second of these Greek papyri found in the Fayûm. It is exceedingly fragmentary; the date is of the V century B. C. It contains four articles, all of which pertain to and explain the text of Demosthenes contra Aristocratem, *e. g.* on Miltokythes, the Spartan mora, ὁ κάτωθεν νόμος. Harpocration, as Blass shows by parallel quotation, contains the gist and often the words of these alphabetical scholia, but much more briefly abstracted. Blass makes some sensible suggestions as to the probable history and the successive abstraction and condensation of scholia, as in the present case. The probable fountainhead was a regular commentary rather than Atticist collections.

In the Miscellen there occur notes by H. Giske, Zu den Chiliaden des Tzetzes; Th. Mommsen, Zu Ammian; A. Gemoll, Emendationen zu der Hyginischen Lagerbeschreibung; F. Gustafson, ad Ciceronis Tusculanas Disputationes conjecturae XII; Ed. Woelfflin, Satura Critica.

No. II.

P. Pulch, of Strassburg, prints an interesting study, Zu Eudocia, proving that the famous *Violarium* (Ἰωλιά) of the learned Byzantine Empress (flor. circa 1070 A. D.) is really a compilation made by Constantinus Palaeopappa, a Cretan monk, who had been an inmate of a monastery on Mt. Athos. He and other Greek calligraphers and copyists of that time found generous employment at Paris in the time of Henry II, husband of Catherine of Medicis, and of the Cardinal of Lorraine, also a distinguished patron of such men. The paper is an interesting contribution to the history of classic philology in the XVI century. [See A. J. P. III 489.]

R. Foerster (Kiel): Achilles and Polyxena, two unedited declamations of Choricus. Choricus was a noted professor of rhetoric and literature in the age of Justinian.¹ The two pieces edited by Foerster are from a MS of the National Library of Madrid. Foerster edits the text with many emendations; these, however, are generally very palpable, as the copyist of the MS appears to have been very ignorant of Greek. Each declamation is preceded by an hypothesis and *θεωρία* which betoken the practical teacher of rhetoric.

Choricus appears to have been thoroughly imbued with Demosthenes, and he maintains very pure Atticism in construction and vocabulary; a few phrases are direct reminiscences, *e. g.* p. 212, l. 22 *συγκεκρισμένος τὰ τοῦ πολέμου* (from Dem. XXIII 3). In poetical phrases he rarely indulges, *e. g.* *φλόγα προσάγειν*, p. 212, l. 25; *ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῶ*, p. 231, l. 30. Certain phrases are derived from Platonic and Aristotelian vocabulary, as *ψυχαγωγεῖν*, *συλλογίζεσθαι*. The argument is wrought out with great clearness and with as much earnestness as such a subject-matter would admit. Choricus exhibits an excellent faculty of psychological analysis, although this is sometimes brought forward too didactically, not in the proper dramatic manner.

I. Schmidt (Halle) discusses the MSS of Serenus Sammonicus.

Gardthausen: Ursicinus and the Inscription of Dojan. This inscription (edited by Mommsen, C. I. L. III 6159) records a victory over the Goths; spelling and antiquarian detail point to the IV century A. D. Gardthausen in the present paper endeavors to specify dates and persons, assigning the inscription to Constantinus II, son of Constantine the Great.

Vahlen: Varia; Exegetical notes on passages in Cicero, Ovid, Vergil, Seneca, Plautus. This distinguished successor of Haupt and Lachmann shows a strong vein of conservatism in his dealing with texts. He hesitates to leap from the notation of difficulty to the utterance of condemnation. He is careful to exhaust the ranges of parallel literature, and he often uses the mild remedy of a change in punctuation. His Latin, generally limpid and dispassionate, becomes somewhat ruffled when dealing with that band of younger Ritschelians who are continuing their master's edition of Plautus. He imputes to them violent and subjective practices and returns some of their strictures with interest. Schoell, in bracketing Plaut. Trucul. I 1, 60, had remarked of Vahlen "novo igitur exemplo V. ostendit audaciorem esse neminem quam criticum iusto timidiorem." To which V. replies "Poteram respondere ut illa: *ὥς σοφός*. Sed nolo cavillari hominem quem auguror paullatim ultro desitutum mirari si multa quae ipsi nunc sunt certissima, ab aliis aut falsa habebuntur, aut dubia admodum." On p. 268 V. says "admonemur, ne, si qua in veterum libris a nostra dicendi consuetudine abhorrent, ne veteribus quidem potuisse placere confidentius affirmemus." Vahlen's method while avoiding specious brilliancy would seem to be more apt to make thorough scholars.

K. Lincke (Jena): Zur Xenophonkritik. This elaborate and somewhat rambling paper sets forth the theory that many passages in Xenophon's Anabasis are not late interpolations, but additions, probably, by the first editor or some one near to Xenophon. Of course there are additions of grosser and quite

¹ See American Journal of Philology, I 79.

palpable sort, as the summaries at the beginning of books II, III, IV, V and VII, also the general summary of tribes and nations at the end of the *Anabasis*. In many of his bracketings, Lincke reaffirms the critical judgment of Cobet, Schenkel, Krueger and others. A typical addition of such early addition, according to L., is the note on Apollo and Marsyas, *Anab.* I 2, 8. Here the style, too, serves L. as a handle for his condemnation, there being a series of monotonous, poorly connected data. L. also objects to the use of *σοφία* for musical skill. Lincke's paper may prove very handy for its presentation of a conspectus of doubtful or difficult passages in the *Anabasis*. At the same time one cannot help feeling that the critic cast around for more material after the façade of his critical stricture was completed. This is the impression produced by his strictures on III 4, 7 sqq. (Larisa and Mespila); where slight difficulties are stretched considerably, and where his comments on points of detail seem to have been biased in advance by his general theory. In conclusion, L. applies his theory of *early additions* to the *Cynegeticus*.¹ That book, according to Lincke, was not indeed written by Xenophon when a young man, but edited after his death by a young man with a young man's additions, such as the heavy mythological embellishment of the preface, etc.

The minor papers of this number are notes, by Hirzel on the Democritean *Diotimos*; by P. Stengel on Libations of wine in connection with burnt offerings; by A. Piccolomini, *De loco quodam vitae Euripidis*; and Th. Kock, A reply to van Herwerden on *Aristoph. Ran.* 548.

E. G. SIHLER.

ZEITSCHRIFT DER DEUTSCHEN MORGENLÄNDISCHEN GESELLSCHAFT. 1882. III and IV Heft.

1. In continuation of Flügel's account of 'Abd al-ghānī's third and first journeys (*Zeitschrift*, 16, 651), J. Gildemeister gives extracts from his second journey, from Damascus to Jerusalem, made A. D. 1690. The interest of these travels lies in the geographical notices, and in the description of Moslem sacred places in and around Jerusalem. The author travelled in state, with a retinue of pupils, and was everywhere, as a great scholar, honorably received, and all means of obtaining information were placed at his disposal. His report gives a curious picture of the Moslem religious ideas of the day, which, however, seem not to differ greatly from what we now find in the East. With the Arabic devotion to names 'Abd al-ghānī begins his work with a list of the names of Jerusalem, eighteen in number, most of them from the Hebrew, with various distortions of form, as Babush for Yabus (Jebus), though this may be a scribal error. Perhaps the most valuable historical statement of the book is the account of the Haram (described by other Moslem pilgrims also), with its mosques, domes, and graves of the patriarchs. The existence of two rival graves of Moses occasions our traveller some embarrassment, but he takes refuge in the reflection that bodies are sometimes removed from one grave to another. The poetry scattered freely through the book Gildemeister pronounces to be generally poor.

¹ See *American Journal of Philology*, III 199.

2. Professor Bacher's article on "Abulwalid Ibn Janāḥ and the modern Hebrew poetry," cites a number of poetical quotations from Ibn Janāḥ's Hebrew-Arabic Dictionary, giving the names of the poets (these are of two classes, the liturgical or Paritanim or Piut-poets (ποίηται), and the non-liturgical), and illustrating the new forms and meanings of words which they employ. In this late poetry is found not only a considerable widening in the significations of biblical words, but also free departure from the masoretic rules of punctuation, and Abulwalid finds occasion to go into discussions like those of which the Arabic grammarians are so fond; thus there is a defence of קָרַב and נָעַל as stat. const. of קָרַב and נָעַל, and of the preposition עָבַר, used instead of the fuller form בְּעָבַר. Among words used in non-biblical senses may be mentioned חֵן (found in Old Testament only in Job xli 4, in sense of "grace, comeliness"), which the Piut-poets employ in the sense "discourse," taking it from דְּרַחֲמֵי, first as "prayer," and then as speech in general. For another biblical hapaxlegomenon, שָׁנֵאן (Ps. lxxviii 18), properly "repetition," we find in the Paitanin the rendering that the King James English Version has adopted, "angels," which was, apparently, the generally accepted signification among the later Jews (so Saadia and the Targum). The old versions all stumble at the word, twisting it in various ways, and the Jewish interpreters seem to have taken the signification "angels" by a simple *tour de force* from the context. Bacher accompanies his citations with instructive critical remarks and references to Jewish authorities.

3. In reply to Dr. Nager's article (see the Journal II 7) Dr. Fürst defends his interpretation of *Azkara* and *Shem Hammephorash* ("the distinctly pronounced tetragrammaton") by an examination of various passages of the Talmud in which they occur. There is no doubt that the verb פָּרַשׁ (in Pael) is used in the sense of "distinctly or expressly pronouncing the divine name," and that the prohibition of such pronunciation extended only to the name יְהוָה. In regard to אִזְכָּרָה the question is whether it is used of other divine names than the tetragrammaton, to which Dr. Fürst's answer (well supported by citations) is that in later times when the designation *Shem Hammephorash* had been generally adopted, and the original signification of *Azkara* had been forgotten, the latter was used of the other divine names, which are included in the category כִּנְיָיִם "cognomina."

4. Franz Praetorius expresses the opinion that the Šafa alphabet contains at least 25 letters, instead of 23, as Halévy holds (Journ. As., VII series, vols. 10 and 17), but thinks it impossible to speak with confidence on this point till the inscriptions have been more certainly deciphered.

Book Notices. 1. Nöldeke's highly commendatory reviews of Socin's Texts of modern Aramaic dialects from Urmia to Mosul, and of W. Wright's edition of the Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite are characterized by his usual richness of text-critical, grammatical, historical, and geographical remark, too detailed to be given here; it may be mentioned that he prefers the spelling Ōrhāi (later Ūrhōi) to Wright's Ōrhāi or Ūrhāi (Edessa). Having better material at his disposal, Wright has been able to produce a correcter edition of Joshua than Martin, and so to make accessible the contents of this valuable chronicle,

whose date is given by Wright and Nöldeke as A. D. 507. 2. Kautzsch gives a detailed statement of the contents of Stade's *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (1881 and first number of 1882), article by article, with critical characterization of the positions of the various contributors. His verdict is in general favorable, but he expresses the hope that the new Journal will not become merely the mouthpiece of one critical school (namely, that represented by Reuss, Graf, Kuenen, Wellhausen, and others), but will number among its contributors defenders of all existing tendencies. Among the most noteworthy of the articles which have up to this time appeared in the *Zeitschrift* are Stade's on Zech. ix-xiv, which prophecy he assigns to the Greek period, and Giesebrecht's examination of the language of the Hexateuch in order to determine whether the linguistic phenomena permit or forbid the assignment of the Priest-Codex or Elohist to the period B. C. 620-450. His lexicographical result (herein he continues Ryssel's work) is as follows: Of the characteristic words of the PC there are found in the literature up to B. C. 700 at most 28, of which 12 are in Isaiah, Micah, Hosea, Amos; while there are 58 in Jeremiah and Lamentations, 29 in Deuteronomy, 72 in the exilic Isaiah, 192 in Ezekiel, over 80 in Job and Proverbs, 229 in Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, 11 in Judges, 6 in Samuel, 31 in Kings. This striking result is entitled to careful attention from the opponents of the post-exilic date of the Elohist. 3. Nestle has notices of Hoffmann's edition of the Syrian account of Julian the Apostate, and of Baethgen's edition and translation of the Syriac Grammar of Mar Elias of Tirhan. The latter is the only printed original East-Syrian grammar, and also the oldest surviving work that can make pretensions to the name of a Syriac grammar, its date being about A. D. 1000. 4. The Chinese grammar of Georg von der Gabelentz (Leipzig, 1881) is declared by Grube to be an epoch-making book. In ZDMG 32, 601 v. d. Gabelentz described what he thought to be the proper way of treating Chinese grammar, and his present work is intended to be an illustration of the principles there laid down. For the first time, says Grube, we here have the study of the Chinese language emancipated from the methods of the Latin grammars, and put on the basis of an examination of the facts themselves. The author calls in question (as Lepsius had already done in 1861) the original monosyllabism of the Chinese tongue, and the reviewer adds that he himself has shown the impossibility of this supposed original monosyllabism by a comparison between the Chinese and the Tibetan and related languages, in his essay, *Die sprachgeschichtliche Stellung des Chinesischen*, Leipzig, 1881. 5. The contents of Ignatius Goldziher's work on Islam (unfortunately written in Hungarian, Budapest, 1881) are described by Bacher as being "rich and interesting." The six chapters treat of: The religion of the desert and of Islam; The traditions of Islam; Saint-worship, and the remains of older religions; Buildings, in connection with the Muhammedan conception of the world; Muhammedan University life; Incorrect opinions respecting Islam. Goldziher takes the field against Sprenger and others, and maintains that Islam is not in any sense a development of the Arabian national thought, but is, on the contrary, a complete denial and reversal of all the habits and tendencies of the people. This is doubtless an exaggeration of one side of the phenomenon, but has its rights over against similar exaggerations of the other side.

At the request of the editors of the *Zeitschrift*, Dr. H. Guthe describes his work on the Siloam inscription, and gives a Hebrew transliteration, German translation, and commentary, with a photograph of his gypsum cast. The transliteration is as follows (the stars represent illegible letters, those in parenthesis-marks are not quite certain, those in square brackets are supplied):

- 1 ** הנקבה · וזה · היה · דבר · הנקבה · בעור
2 הגרין · אש · אל · רעו · ובעור · שלש · אמת · לה(ג) · **** קל · (א)ש · ק
3 (ר)א · אל · רעו · כי · הית · זרה · בצר · מימן · (ו)מ · ** (אל) · ובים · ה
4 נקבה · הכו · ההצבם · אש · לקרת · רעו · גרין · על · (ג)רין · וילכו ·
5 המים · מן · המוצא · אל · הברכה · במאתים · (ו)אלף · אמה · ו(מ)א
6 ת · אמה · היה · (ג)בה · הצר · על · ראש · ההצבים

The translation of Professor E. Kautzsch, slightly modified by Guthe, is as follows: 1. "The cut [is finished]. And this was the manner of the cut. While [they were] still [swinging] 2. the picks one toward the other, and while there were yet three cubits to [cut through], [there was heard] the voice of one who cal- 3. led to another, for there was a cleft (?) in the rock on (or from) the south [and on (or from) the north]. And on the day of the 4. cut the masons struck one toward the other, pick against pick, and there came 5. the water from the spring to the pool 1200 cubits, and two hundred cubits was the height of the rock above the heads of the masons." The readings of the photograph are in some cases nearly or quite illegible where Dr. Guthe expresses no doubt; in such cases he must have got his idea of the reading from the inscription itself, and failed to make a complete transfer on his cast. Nevertheless, we are under great obligation to him for the perseverance and skill which he has shown in procuring and publishing the cast. The only new words in the inscription are *נקבה* and *זרה*, of which the former is clear (from *נקב* "to pierce"). No satisfactory sense has been found for *זרה*. Of known Semitic stems we could think only of *זור*, which in Hebrew signifies only "to boil, be proud," but in Arabic means to "increase, be over and above, remain," whence the noun would signify "a remaining part, or an attached part," which, however, yields no clear sense. Guthe and others assume the sense "cleft, fissure," from what they think the necessity of the connection, but there seems to be no etymological basis for this signification, and it must remain at best doubtful. The grounds for the assumption of the bracketed words will appear from the connection. The letters of the inscription are nearly identical in form with those of the Mesha-stone (9th century B. C.) except the Aleph, which is like the Aleph of the Eshmunazar-inscription (4th century B. C.). From a comparison with II Chron. xxxii 30, Guthe (regarding Isa. viii 6 as not decisive) assigns the tunnel and the inscription to the time of Hezekiah, latter part of 8th century B. C.

Other articles in this number are: On the *Mānava-Gṛhya-Sūtra*, by P. v. Bradke, proof that the *Mānava* belongs to the *Māitrāyaṇī-Çākhā*, with remark that the transition from the Vedic prose to the classic metrical prose was made through the epic poetry; Extract from the poems of the Tatar sage *Nāṣir Chusran*, by Prof. Dr. Hermann Ethé; Specimens from various Indian poets, by Theodor Aufrecht; On the *Ashi-Yasht* of the *Avesta*, by Chr. Bartholomae; On *Avestan text-criticism*, by F. Spiegel; *Avestan studies*, by C. de Harlez; and several short articles.

C. H. Toy.

JOURNAL ASIATIQUE. 1882.

No. 2. August–September (No. 1 contains the Annual Report, by Renan).

1. Senart continues his studies of the inscriptions of Piyadasi (see the Journal, No. 7).

2. The Sanskrit inscriptions, collected in Camboge by M. Aymonier, Representative of the French Protectorate, and sent by him to the Asiatic Society at Paris, were submitted for examination to a committee consisting of Messrs. Barth, Bergaigne and Senart, who give a detailed report of the contents, and warmly commend Aymonier's work. Bergaigne points out the evidence furnished by the inscriptions of the missionary activity of Brahmanism, which, indeed, prepared the way for Buddhism; Brahmanism, says Barth elsewhere, failed to penetrate anterior Asia not from lack of the proselyting spirit, but by reason of the barriers opposed to its progress by more compact religions, vigorous political organizations, and national culture superior to its own. Barth adds annotated translations of two of the inscriptions (see the Journal, No. 11).

3. M. Arthur Amiaud gives an improved translation of the non-Semitic inscription of Hammurabi (Cuneiform Ins. of West. Asia, 4, 15, 1) for the purpose of putting alongside of it an Assyrian translation which he has taken almost wholly from the Semitic inscriptions of the same king Hammurabi, and showing the striking correspondence that exists between the composition of the former and that of the latter. He declares that there is a similar correspondence in all the non-Semitic inscriptions of the five first plates of the W. A. I. He concludes that if the authors of the inscriptions wrote in two different languages, it seems at least that they thought in only one. He says nothing further on this point, but apparently reserves his more explicit statement for another article.

Book Notices. There are highly commendatory notices of Jäschke's Tibetan-English Dictionary (London, 1881) by Feer, and of de Harlez's Pehlvi Manual (Paris, 1880) by de Dillon. Siouffi, French vice-consul at Mosul, communicates some very curious creation-legends of the Yezidis, together with an account of their present customs.

No. 3 of the Journal, containing the index to the Seventh Series, has not yet appeared.

1883. No. 1, January (beginning of the Eighth Series).

1. Maspero gives text and translation of the love-songs of the Turin papyrus, and the papyrus Harris 500, and points out certain resemblances between them and the Old Testament Song of Songs.

2. Clément Huart, Interpreter of the French Embassy at Constantinople, gives a long list of Arabic words and expressions peculiar to the Damascus dialect, supplementing the Arabic-French dictionary of Cuche, and Dozy's Supplement to Arabic dictionaries. The strange forms *'arjini*, *warjini*, *farjini*, all meaning "cause me to see," he derives from the ordinary stem *ra'a* "to see," in which the middle radical Alif has been changed into *j*, with prefixing of the conjunctions *wa* and *fa*.

C. H. Toy.

MNEMOSYNE, Vol X, Part III.

The first article (pp. 225-38) of this number is by Cobet, containing criticisms on Appian, *de bellis civilibus*. He places first in parallel columns a passage which occurs substantially in the same terms in IV 58 and III 57; "hunc locum ex nescio quo historico descriptum quum semel Appianus apposuisset eius rei immemor eundem iterum in rem suam convertit." Cobet shows that errors have been introduced into the later quotation which do not occur in the earlier. V 92, 28: ἐπενόει τοὺς ὀπλίτας ὀλκάσιν ἐπιβήσας ἐς Σικελίαν περαιούσιν. "Debebat ἐπιβιβάσας scribere et ἐπέβησα Homero et Herodoto relinquere. Sed apud sequiores πάντα ῥήματα ἦν ὁμοῦ neque in quoquam erat ὁ νοῦς ὁ διακοσμήσων." V 101, 4: τοῖς προφύλαξι τῶν ναυπηγουμένων Καίσαρι νεῶν οἷα σκηπτὸς ἈΦΑΝΩΣ ἐμπίπτων, "ecquid absurdus est quam σκηπτὸς ἀφανῶς ἐμπίπτων, ut apud iocosum poetam in rebus manifesto absurdis ludentem: *le tonnerre en silence Par des éclairs obscurs annonçait sa présence?* Exime duas literulas et erit ἈΦΝΩ,¹ quod Appianus passim usurpat pro *repente, necopinato*." IV 94, 33: post caedem Caesaris αὐτίκα ἡ βουλὴ τὴν κοινὴν γνώμην ἐξέφηνε σαφῶς μὲν ὅτε καὶ γέρα τυραννοκτονικὰ ἐψηφίζοντο εἶναι, ἐπισχόντος δὲ αὐτοῦς Ἀντωνίου καθ' ὑπόκρισιν ἈΤΑΡΑΞΙΑΣ. "Senatus interfecto Caesaris praemia decernere volebat, sed retinuit eos Antonius. Retinuit autem καθ' ὑπόκρισιν ἀταραξίας. Quid tandem est καθ' ὑπόκρισιν ἀταραξίας? Nihil prorsus. Interpres: *sed revocati ab eo consilio patres per Antonium astute dissimulantem quas excitaturus esset turbas*. Vides interpretem quoque astute dissimulare se ea verba non intelligere.² Lenissima emendatio claram lucem afferet. Rescribe καθ' ὑπόκρισιν ἀΠΡΑΞΙΑΣ. Ἀπραξία est *iustitium* quum neque cum populo neque cum patribus quidquam recte agi posset eoque prae-textu usus Antonius prohibuit quo minus patres quidquam decernerent." He shows however that Appian's usual word for *iustitium* is ἀργίας: *iustitium indicere* = ἀργίας προγράφειν: *iustitium remittere* = ἀργίας ἀναρῆναι or βασιτάζειν. Cobet closes these notes with some general remarks on the style of Appian. "Utitur Appianus oratione simplici et incomta et perspicua ad intelligendum. Totus in rebus verba eadem de iisdem solet ponere inops magis quam copiosus et minime sectatur τὴν καλλιέπειαν multorum naufragiis infamem scopulum . . . Non vitat vitiosam vulgi συνήθειαν et horum fere incuriosus ac negligens nonnumquam in mirificos errores se induit. Auxerat, ut eruditi omnes, dicendi copiam assidua lectione Veterum, et saepe pellucet Thucydidis dictio, saepe Demosthenis, saepissime omnium Herodotea. Non putide haec et pueriliter imitatur sed quae longo usu imbiberat utitur pro suis." This statement is supported by many citations which establish each point; and he says at the end: "Complura alia de genere hoc ex Herodoti et Appiani comparatione colligi possunt, quam rem iuniorum ingenio et industriae commendo."

On page 239, with the heading 'ΑΔΙΑΝΘΗΤΑ Latina et Gallica,' Cobet gives

¹ The mistake would be mediated by the late and rare form ΑΦΝΩΣ.—B. L. G.

² The passage occurs in a speech of Cassius where he narrates the events that followed upon Caesar's death. For my part, I cannot see the difficulty of καθ' ὑπόκρισιν ἀταραξίας in view of Plutarch's words (Vit. Anton. c. 14): ἐξῆι τῆς βουλῆς λαμπρότατος ἀνδρώπων ὁ Ἀντώνιος ἀννηρκεῖναι δοκῶν ἐμφύλιον πόλεμον καὶ πράγμασι ἀνσκολίας ἔχουσι καὶ ταραχὰς οὐ τὰς τυχεύουσας ἐμφρονέστατα κεχρησθαι καὶ πολιτικώτατα. A. pretended to be opposed to all agitation. Besides, how can ὑπόκρισις be used as equivalent to σκῆψις or πρόφασις?—B. L. G.

M. Bréal's interpretation 'antiquissimae, ut perhibent, inscriptionis,' cited in this Journal, Vol. III, p. 107; and exclaims: "ὦ Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ, τῆς λεπτότητος τῶν φρενῶν. Quam suaviter in sinu ridebit scurra Romanus, qui hanc nugatorium inscriptionem ioci causa de suo commentus est." For Cobet's own view of it see p. 246 of the same volume.

The next article (pp. 240-46) is by J. Van Der Vliet, on passages in the letters of Seneca. His suggestions are often ingenious and probable; but some of the changes proposed have been already adopted by the Editors; e. g. that on Ep. 50, §2.

Next, K. G. P. Schwartz (pp. 247-50) gives notes 'ad Platonem et Lucianum.' The only passage of Plato touched upon is Phaed. 62a, which he proposes to emend by inserting the spaced words: καὶ οὐδέποτε τυγχάνει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, ὥσπερ καὶ τᾶλλα, ἐστὶν ὅτε καὶ οἷς βέλτιον ὢν ἄλλως τε καὶ οἷς βέλτιον τεθνάναι ἢ ζῆν. This would suit the sense very well, but is unnecessary if we understand the preceding τοῦτο to mean τὸ μὴ θεμιτὸν εἶναι αὐτὸν ἑαυτὸν ἀποκτινύναι, and not with M. Schwartz simply τὸ αὐτὸν ἑαυτὸν ἀποκτινύναι.

We have then emendations proposed for some thirty passages of Lucian. Only one can be quoted. "*Bis Accusatus* c. 3, τοσαύτας ἐώλων δίκας φυλάττομεν . . . καὶ μάλιστα ὁπόσαι τὰς ἐπιστήμας καὶ τέχνας πρὸς ἀνθρώπους τιναὶ ξυνέστησαν. Sine dubio corrigendum ταῖς ἐπιστήμας καὶ τέχνας. Notissima locutio est δίκη μοι συνίσταται πρὸς τινα."

Cobet next (pp. 251-57) contributes some notes on Galen. He illustrates the condition of his MSS by comparing quotations made by Galen from Hdt. II 36 and Ar. Av. 471 with the texts as they appear in our editions. Galen's own rule as to style is quoted; VI, p. 579: ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν τοῖς ὀνόμασιν οὕτως ἐχρησάμην ὥς οἱ νῦν ἀνθρώποι χρῶνται, βέλτιον ἡγούμενος εἶναι διδάξαι σαφῶς τὰ πράγματα τοῦ παλαιῶς ἀττικίζειν. "Athenienses Galeni aetate utebantur τῇ κοινῇ τῶν Ἑλλήνων συνηθείᾳ . . . sed in tali re παλαιῶς addi non solet, quia omnes sciebant ἀττικίζειν non nisi de vetere lingua Attica usurpari." A passage in VII, p. 291, is quoted to justify the substitution of κἀδηφαγίας for καὶ γυμνασίων in Ar. Nub. 417, "Absurdum est ἀπέχει γυμνασίων, in quo nulla inest luxuriae notio. Apud Drogenem Laetium, ubi hic versus laudatur, pro γυμνασίων legitur ἀδηφαγίας, quod unice verum esse et Aristophani reddendum ratio demonstrat et confirmat locus Galeni." Several passages are quoted simply for their interest: e. g. VIII, p. 148: πυθόμενος τῷ Ἀρχιγένοι τι γεγράφθαι βιβλίον ἐνθα διδάσκει μνήμης βεβλαμμένης ἀνάκτησιν, εὐθέως περιῆλλον ἀπάσας μὲν τὰς βιβλιοθήκας, ἅπαντας δὲ τοὺς βιβλιοπώλας, ἅπαντας δὲ οὓς ἥδειν ἱατροὺς ἐσπουδακότας περὶ τὰ συγγράμματα τὰνδρὸς εὐπορῆσαι τοῦ βιβλίου προηρημένους. VIII, p. 151: ὥς ἐγωγε καὶ νῦν θεῶμαι ΚΑΤΑ τὰς τῶν νοσούντων ἐπισκέψεις τοὺς ἱατροὺς ἐν τῇ κοινολογίᾳ πνιθανομένους ἀλλήλων κατὰ τίνα λόγον τὸδε βοήθημα πρὸ τοῦδε συνεβούλευσαν. "Optima haec erat et utilissima medicorum consuetudo, sed vitium est in verbis: κατὰ τὰς τῶν νοσούντων ἐπισκέψεις. Interpres vertit ut debuit, *intervisitandum aegros*. Sed quicunque sentit haec *coram aegrotantibus* agi non potuisse rescribito MEτὰ τὰς τῶν νοσούντων ἐπισκέψεις." "Est operae pretium videre quam alto supercilio Graeci linguas barbarorum contemnerent. Paullo ante Galenus scribit (VIII, p. 585) ἐὰν προσέχῃς τὸν νοῦν ταῖς φωναῖς τῶν βαρβάρων διαλέκτων εἰση σαφῶς τὰς μὲν ταῖς τῶν σῶν, τὰς δὲ ταῖς τῶν βατράχων ἢ κολοῶν ἢ κοράκων ἐοικυίας. Eiusdem-

modi est quod Julianus scribit de poetis trans Rhenum pag. 337d: *ἑθεασάμην . . . τοὺς ὑπὲρ τὸν Ῥῆνον βαρβάρους ἀγρία μέλη λέξει πεποιημένα παραπλησίᾳ τοῖς κρωμοῖς τῶν τραχὺ βοῶντων ὀρνίθων ἀδοντας.*"

In the next article (pp. 258-89) Naber continues his *Euripidea*. In Ion. 54, he proposes *θριγοφύλακα* for *χρυσοφύλακα*, which he supports by comparing vv. 315 and 414, explaining *θριγός* to be 'deauratum saeptum saxis structum quo, adytum templi circumclusum erat.' In 304 he writes *Φοίβῳ ζυγῆναι* for *μυγῆναι*, asserting that in the Tragic dialect the rule of ordinary Attic speech must hold by which *μίννται ὁ ἀνὴρ τῇ γυναικί, οὐχ ἡ γυνὴ τῷ ἀνδρί*, though he is aware that the distinction is unknown to Homer, Hesiod, or Pindar. In 506, *οὐτ' ἐπὶ κερκίσιν οὔτε λόγους φάτιν αἰὼν*, he feels the difficulty that has troubled others, that *λόγους* expresses the time of gossip too vaguely to be properly contrasted with *κερκίσιν*. 'Quodnam praeterea tempus habent virgines, quod amicis confabulationibus dare possunt? Dum lavandria, uti arbitror, siccant ad solem. Vide modo Hippol. 125. Hinc conieci *οὐτ' ἐπὶ κερκίσιν οὔτε πλυνοῖς*.' In Helen. 262, *ἐξαλειφθεῖς ὡς ἀγαλμα* is objected to as unintelligible. 'Solentne deorum signa *ἐξαλειφθῆναι*? Cur? Quando? Quomodo?'¹ Then taking a hint from Plat. Sympos. 215b where Alcibiades compares Socrates to one of those Sileni, *οἱ δίχα διοικθέντες φαίνονται ἐνδοθεν ἀγάλματ' ἔχοντες θεῶν*, he conjectures that Helen said

*εἴθ' ἐξανοιχθεῖς ὡς ἀγαλμ', αὐθις πάλιν
αἰσχιον εἶδος ἀντὶ τοῦ καλοῦ ἔλαβον.*

'Quid mirum, si Euripides incidit in eandem comparisonem, in quam postea Plato? Quamquam Plato melius, nam turpis Silenus interdum Helenam intus celat, sed formosa Helena non celat Silenum.' He further argues that *ἀγαλμα* means always a sculptured figure, not a picture. On Hel. 1590 he writes: 'Nondum expedire potuerunt viri docti *πάλιν πλέωμεν Ναξίαν* · *κέλευε σύ*. Codex habet *ἄξιαν*, cui superscriptum *να*, unde *Ναξίαν* in Aldinam fluxit. Scribit Hermannus *ἄξιῳ*, Paleius *τί νῦν πλέωμεν Ναυπλίαν*, Badhamus *ἀντίαν* : sed haec desperantium sunt conamina. Emendandum: *πάλιν πλέωμεν* · *δεξιὰν κέλευε σύ*. Tantulum vitium omnes latuisse! Nec potero fortasse excitare locum ubi hoc ipsum legitur *δεξιὰν κελεύειν*, sed quum Aristophanes dixerit : *ὀρθὴν κελεύεις ἢ τὸ δένδρον φαίνεται*, nihil est cur dubitemus an recte dicatur *δεξιὰν κελεύειν*.' In writing on the Bacchae he speaks of the edition of Wecklein as very useful to him 'unde praeterea in mea librorum penuria cognoscere potui quid viri docti ad hanc tragoediam explanandam attulissent.' Among other books Wecklein refers to a dissertation by Middendorf, 'qui in observationibus ad hanc fabulam sex paginis refutavit quae Boeckhius, quo erat ingenii acumine, persecutus fuerat per paginas triginta,' in regard to the question whether the younger Euripides had any hand in bringing about the existing condition of this play. 'Equidem Middendorffio careo uti et aliis quam plurimis, quos minime contemno, sed quos comparare mihi non potui, quia bibliotheca Amstelodamensis libris Latinis et Graecis haud ita opipare instructa est, neque sacculus meus sufficit ad omnia. Leidensis bibliotheca mihi quaedam commodavit: etiam Herwerdeno nonnulla debeo; sed Middendorffius in hanc urbem palorum et

¹ Has the critic forgotten Kallimachos, Lavacr. Palladis, 13? See Müller, *Archaeol. der Kunst*, p. 69.—B. L. G.

paludum nondum advolavit.' Naber's observations on this play and on the Iph. T., Iph. Aul. and Cyclops are always entertaining and sometimes helpful. But he is occasionally very perverse. On Bacch. 259: εἰ μή σε γῆρας πολὺν ἐξεργύετο | καθῆσ' ἂν ἐν βάκχαισι δέσμιος μέσας, he says 'praefero optativum καθῆ' ἂν. *Sederes*, non *sedisses*;' and he argues, Bacch. 1065, that for κατήγεν, ἤγεν, ἤγεν εἰς μέλαν πέδον we should read κατήγεν ἡρέμ' ἡρέμ'.

The next article (pp. 290-94) contains Platonic notes by Dr. Badham, chiefly on the Philebus; but none of them are available for this notice.

J. J. Cornelissen (pp. 295-300) follows with notes on Petronius. One or two of them may be quoted. §4, '*parentes obiurgatione digni sunt, qui nolunt liberos suos severa lege perficere*. Legendum est *producere*, i. e. educare ut est apud Plaut. Asin. III 1, 40; Ter. Adelph. III 2, 16; Juvenal, Sat. 14, 228.' §80, '*fulminatus hac pronuntiatione, sic ut eram, sine gladio in lectulum decidi, et attulisset mihi damnatas* [Buech. *damnatus*] *manus, si non inimici victoriae invidissem*. Absurde legitur *sine gladio*, nam neque si sine gladio in lectulum Encolpius decidisset, mortis sibi conciscendae consilium iniisset et supra narravit, postquam Ascylos gladium parricidali manu strinxerit, se idem fecisse; legendum igitur, *sicut eram, stricto gladio*.'

D. L. Van Stegeren follows (pp. 301-08) with *Varia Critica*, chiefly on Plutarch. In Plut. Cim. 13, ἵππου μὲν δρόμον αἰετὴς Ἑλληνικῆς ἀπέχειν θαλάττης, Cobet rightly inserts ἡμέρας, comparing Dem. 19, 273. But ἵππειος δρόμος or ἵππικὸν διάστημα was probably a recognized distance. Cf. Sol. 23: νόμον ἐγραψεν ὅπου μὲν ἐστὶ δημόσιον φρέαρ ἐντὸς ἵππικου χρησθαι τούτῳ· τὸ δὲ ἵππικὸν διάστημα τεσσάρων ἢ σταδίων, and this is confirmed by other quotations. Fault is found with Cobet, who has said "ut enim in bello, sic in grammatica nihil contemni oportet, nec quisquam qui minuta haec spreverit, unquam facit in re critica operae pretium," that he never applies crasis to τὰ ὅπλα. If the passages in Aristophanes where the words are found contracted, and other analogical ones, do not establish the rule, consider that the words 'apud omnes Graecos in usu fuisse ob παράγγελμα militare. Solent enim haec iussa et παραγγέλματα omni tempore et apud omnes populos per ipsam rei naturam esse et brevissima et maxime perspicua. Credasne igitur, ut hoc utar, in Anabasi VII 1, 22 in tumultu militari ad Byzantium Xenophontem languida illa παρεγγυῆσαι, θέσθε τὰ ὅπλα? imo iussit, puto, θέσθε θῶπλα . . . ad arma apud ipsum Xenophontem est εἰς θῶπλα.' In Lysand. 2 Plutarch quotes Aristotle as τὰς μεγάλας φύσεις ἀποφαίνων μελαγχολικὰς, ὡς τὴν Σωκράτους καὶ Πλάτωνος καὶ Ἡρακλέους. 'Quis unquam fando audivit Herculem, qui semper bibax et edax apud Aristophanem et in fine Euripidis Alcestidis e. g. exhibitur . . . fuisse melancholicum . . . quis credat Plutarchum principem Graecorum heroum, qui Athenis adeo ut deus colebatur, post Socratem et Platonem demum nominavisse?' He is confident that we should read Περικλέους. But the passage of Aristotle to which Plutarch refers (Probl. p. 953a 27) leaves no doubt that Ἡρακλέους is the right reading. For before naming τῶν ὑστερον Ἐμπεδοκλῆς καὶ Πλάτων καὶ Σωκράτης καὶ ἕτεροι συγχροῖ τῶν γνωρίμων, Aristotle devotes several lines to the proof that the history of Herakles is an illustration of the rule that πάντες ὅσοι περιττοὶ γεγόνασιν ἄνδρες . . . φαίνονται μελαγχολικοὶ ὄντες.¹

¹A melancholy proof that van S. does not know what μελαγχολικός meant. Greek μελαγχολικός and Dutch *zwaarmoedig*, *droefgeestig* are not the same.—B. L. G.

J. J. Hartman (pp. 309-18) contributes more *Euripidea*. These notes are chiefly on the Bacchae. A single specimen may be given. Bacch. 1070: Πενθέα δ' ἰδρύσας ἐλατίνων ὄζων ἐπι | ὀρθὸν μεθίει διὰ χειρῶν βλάστημ' ἄνω | ἀτρέμα, φυλάσσω μὴ ἀναχαιτίσειέ νιν. It is argued that a branch large enough to carry Pentheus could not have been called ὄζος, and that since the verb ἀναχαιτίζειν 'de equo dicitur, iam nostro versu aliquid requiritur quod ad eam metaphoram ducat'; and therefore we must read ἐλατίνων ὄζων ἐπι.

Cobet (pp. 319-23) furnishes some notes on Longinus περὶ ὕψους. "IV 4, e libro Xenophontis affert: αἰδημονεστέρονς ἂν αὐτοὺς (Lacedaemonios) ἡγήσαιο καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὈΦΘΑΛΜΟΙΣ παρθένων. Vetustissimum mendum est ὈΦΘΑΛΜΟΙΣ pro ΘΑΛΑΜΟΙΣ, id quod Longinum fugit. Rectissime dicitur αἱ ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς κόραι, sed pupillae in oculis non possunt παρθένοι appellari. Frigide et inficite Theopompus apud Longinum ita dixit: ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς κόρας, μὴ πόρνas, ἔχων. Absurdum fuisset ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς παρθένους ἔχων. Dixit tamen sic Aretaëus Cappadox a Ruhnkenio laudatus: τάδε πάσχει ἄμφω τὰ εἶδεα καὶ ἡ ἐν τοῖσι ὀφθαλμοῖσι παρθένος.'

Dr. Badham (p. 325) emends Thuc. VIII 102, 2 very happily by writing: βουλομένοι ἐκπλεῦσαι ἐς τὴν εὐρυχωρίαν καὶ τὰς τῶν πολέμιων ναῦς τὰς μὲν ἐν Ἀβύδῳ ἐκκαίδεκα ἔλαθον τῷ αἰφνιδίῳ ἐπίπλῳ, προειρημένης φυλακῆς ὅπως αὐτῶν ἀνακὰς ἐξουσιν ἣν ἐκπλέωσιν, τὰς δὲ μετὰ τοῦ Μινδάρον ἅμα τῇ ἑφ τὴν διώξιν εὐθὺς ποιούμενον, οὐ φθάνουσι πᾶσαι κτέ.

The part concludes with miscellaneous notes by Cobet, chiefly on Lysias.

PART IV.

The first article (pp. 337-54) in this number contains emendations on the tenth book of Plato's Laws. Many of the corrections proposed are violent, but perhaps not more so than is justified by the exceedingly corrupt state of the text, which only heroic remedies can cure. The writer has not consulted the convenience of his readers by quoting enough of the context in each case to render the proposed emendation intelligible without reference to the book itself; and has not even added the sectional letter to the page-number. Accordingly, one must read through the whole book, if one would appreciate the article; and no part of it is really available for this notice. Two of the shorter passages may, however, be quoted, as specimens of the writer's manner. "P. 893: invocati eunt (sic) Di ἐπὶ τὴν ἀπόδειξιν [ὡς εἰσὶ] τὴν αὐτῶν. O agninos (ne quam aliam belluam invocem) editores!—ἐχόμενοι δὲ ὡς τινος ἀσφαλούς πείσματος ἐπεισβαίνωμεν εἰς τὸν νῦν λόγον. Quaero τίνος τοῦ πείσματος ἔχονται; ἡ δὴλον ὅτι αὐτῶν τῶν θεῶν; supple igitur—(ὧν) ἐχόμενοι ὡς δὴ τινος κτέ.—Pro ἀσφαλέστατα leg. ἀσφαλέστατον." P. 895: "ἄρτιον ὀνόματι καὶ λόγῳ δίχα διαιρούμενον ἀριθμὸν, προσαγορεύοντες ταῦτ' ὅν. Sic interpungas velim; quod cum feceris, ut ille de cucumi condiendo postremum praecepisse fertur, foras eiicito. Mox pro τὸ ἐάντ' οὐ κινεῖν lege κινεῖν, et δ δὴ expellendum."

The next article, pp. 355-85, contains critical notes on Aristophanes, by S. A. Naber. On the *Acharnenses* he proposes in 2 to read πῶμαλα for τέτταρα, which cannot be explained satisfactorily, and is inconsistent with the subsequent enumeration. In 25 he writes περὶ πρῶτον ξύλον for περὶ πρώτων ξύλων, arguing

that we cannot suppose that the fifty *πρωτάνεις* struggled with each other for the first bench, like Philocleon in *Vespae* 90, since all had the *προεδρία* alike; "sed dum quisque properabat capessere sedem, turba oriebatur intrantium *πὲρ* *πρῶτον ξύλον*." The acc. is found in the same sense in 692: *γέροντ' ἀπολέσαι πολλὸν ἄνδρα περὶ κλεψύδραν*. He interprets 994-9, reading *προσλαβεῖν* for *προσβαλεῖν*, of the simple employments of a country life which Dicaeopolis hopes he will again enjoy when peace is secured; 'vitem seret, ficum, olivam; nihil potest esse simplicius. Sed docti interpretes non satis sibi docti videntur, nisi doctam attulerint interpretationem. Sedulo quaerunt quis sit horum verborum *duplex sensus*. *Nequitia*, inquit, *inest in allusione ad ὄρχεις*, idque ne obliviscamur, etiam bis inculcant, cum poeta *ἀμπελίδος ὄρχον* et *ἡμερίδος ὄρχον* appellaverit . . . ne oliva quidem innocenter seri poterit . . . *rursus in hoc versu obscenitas latet*. Roma locuta est."

On the *Equites*, 230-4, he denies that the words justify the interpretation of the Schol. that *οὐκ εἶχεν αὐτοῦ προσωπεῖον διὰ τὸ δεδουκέναι τοὺς σκευοποιοὺς καὶ μὴ θέλειν μήτε πλάττειν μήτε σχηματίζειν τὴν ὄψιν τοῦ Κλέωνος*. It is merely an ironical jest of the poet. "Qui histrio Cleonem agebat . . . ipso vultu totoque corporis habitu quam exactissime potuit referebat notam personam demagogi. Cleonem uno impetu omnes dum statim agnoscebant, erumpebant in cachinnos et plausum dabant. Demosthenes autem lepidissime negat, larvam satis esse similem, quam in illa comica partium distortionem omnes videbant tam esse similem, ut ovum non ovo similis esse dicerent."

In *Nubes*, 50, not understanding *ἐρίων περιουσίας*, he proposes to write *σιρῶν, ἐριουργίας*, and quotes Columella to show that such *cellae* were apt to have a bad smell, "sed putidum est in tali re veterum testimoniis uti et cavendum est ne imitemur exemplum illius Hispani, qui docte et cum cura demonstravit, pueros apud Athenienses plorare solitos fuisse, quum vapularent." On 417, *οἶνον τ' ἀπέχει καὶ γυμνασίων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνοήτων*, he does not approve the substitution of *ἀδρφαγίας* for *γυμνασίων*, though the line is quoted by Diog. La., perhaps from the second recension, with that reading (see p. 117), because "non placere poterit, si quis reputaverit in reliqua fabula voracitatis non fieri mentionem; nec tamen Herwerdenum sequar, qui *συμποσίων* rescripsit, nam nusquam video Socratem hilare convivium aversatum fuisse." Since, however, we are told in 837 and Av. 1554 that Socrates eschewed the bath, and in 992 and 1045 ff. the *Δίκαιος λόγος* condemns the bath on the ground of its enervating tendency, he proposes that *βαλανεῖον* should be read in this line. But Kock made the same suggestion in his ed. of 1862. On 541-2: *οὐδὲ πρεσβύτης ὁ λέγων τὰπῃ τῇ βακτηρία τύπτει τὸν παρόντ' ἀφανίζων πονηρὰ σκώμματα*, we have a long discussion as to the point of the reference to Eupolis; and then the suggestion is made that we should read *ἄρρητ' ἢ* for *τὰπῃ τῇ* [where the *ἢ* is hard to dispose of] and *φατίζειν* for *ἀφανίζων*: "id tantum incommode accidit quod . . . verbum *φατίζειν* nusquam in comoedia legitur." On 583: *βροντῇ δ' ἐρράγη δὲ ἀστραπῆς, δι' Ἄρματος* is suggested, in allusion to the proverbial expression *ὅταν ἀστράψῃ δὲ Ἄρματος*. In 712, among the other sufferings inflicted on Strepsiades by *οἱ Κορίνθιοι ἐκ τοῦ σκίμποδος ἐξέρποντες*, he mentions *καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐκπίνουσιν*. Naber proposes *τὴν ψωλήν*, a substitution which was made by Brunck in *Lysistr.* 963. But he has not observed that in 719 Strepsiades describes the same affliction by the words *φρούδη ψυχῇ*, which, with the substitution of *ψωλή*, we can hardly suppose to

have been within the competence of his tormentors. In 1138, Strepsiadēs is indignant at the rigor of his stony-hearted creditors who will not recognize as μέτρα καὶ δίκαια his proposals, ὦ δαιμόνιε, τὸ μὲν τι νυνὶ μὴ λάβης, τὸ δ' ἀναβαλοῦ μοι, τὸ δ' ἄφες. Naber quotes the explanation of G. Hermann, "qui Kockio imposuit." "Φιλόγελως sit oportet qui ad tam frigidum iocum subridere possit. Emenda: τὸ μὲν τι νυνὶ μοι λάβε. Verbum non addam." The creditors, however, appear to have understood the matter as Hermann did; for we are told: οὐ φασὶν ποτε οὕτως ἀπολήψεσθ', ἀλλὰ λουδοροῦσί με.

On *Vespaē* 16, Naber suggests ἐδόκον ἀετὸν καταπτόμενον ἐς τὴν ἀγορὰν δρᾶν μέγαν for μέγαν πάνν, as well as two other alterations of the passage which seem less probable. On 98, ἐν θύρᾳ Δῆμον καλόν, he shows that while there is abundant evidence that the Greeks inscribed the names of their favorites on walls and trees, there is none that they did so on doors; and accordingly he would write φιλόρᾳ for θύρᾳ; and if any one objects that such a confirmed cit as Philocleon would never go outside the walls where he could see the trees so "abused," he endeavors to prove that there must have been trees in Athens itself in private grounds or public spaces. On 554, κἄπειτ' εὐθὺς προσιόντι ἐμβάλλει μοι τὴν χεῖρ' ἀπαλὴν τῶν δημοσίων κεκλοφύϊαν, where ἐμβάλλει occurs between two plural verbs, he objects to the ἐμβάλλονσιν of Hirschig, and the ἐμβάλλει μοί τις of Meineke, and proposes προσίων τις ἐμβάλλει τὴν χεῖρ' ἀπαλὴν τὴν κτέ. Some sixteen passages of the *Pax*, also, are commented on in this article.

H. van Herwerden follows, pp. 386-99, with *Conjecturae Epigraphicae* on G. Kaibel's *Epigrammata Graeca*. Two short extracts may be made. "Ὅσσαι γὰρ ψυχαὶ [σεμνῶς τ' ἀγαθῶς τ'] ἐβίωσαν. Licet hoc poetarum genus nihil non sibi permittere videatur, non tamen indicta causa singuli damnandi sunt, ut arbitror. Nempe qui in hoc epigrammate reliqua probe scripsit, huic tribuere nolum cum editore vocabulum pessimae notae ἀγαθῶς pro εὔ, et potius supplerem ὅσσαι γὰρ ψυχαὶ [σεμνῶς θ' ἀγνῶς τ'] ἐβίωσαν." "In Hadriani scriptoris epigrammate reperto apud Thespias vs. 1: ὦ παῖ τοξότα Κυπρίδος λυγείης Kaibelius suspicatur Musarum sacris Thespias translatis Veneri Musarum et speciem et nominationem aliquam accessisse. Quod credat qui poterit. Mihi non persuasum est imperatorem non dedisse γλυκείης."

The next article, pp. 400-13, is by Cobet, entitled *Herodotea*. He uses Stein's text, 1869-71. The apparatus furnished by this editor for the three chief MSS, A of the 10th century, B of the 11th, and R of the 14th, leaves nothing to be desired; and no other authorities are needed: "caeteri codices omnes et quidquid scripturarum ex iis congestum est citra damnum abiici possunt et vel in ignem conici." It is even matter of regret that Stein has reported all the variations he has. "In codicibus antiquissimis (id est saeculo IX, X et XI exaratis) ubique τὸ παραγεγραμμένον ἰῶτα cernitur, in minus antiquis idem ubique omittitur. Hinc farrago discrepantium lectionum nullius pretii et momenti nascitur. In A B constanter ἰῶτα additur, in R eadem constantia semper omittitur. Sexcenties annotatur χρῆζω A B, χρῆζω R . . . et similia passim . . . Apage has ineptias: et omnino omnes scribarum errores, ubi de vera scriptura nulla est dubitatio. Constat inter omnes verbi ἐρχομαι imperfectum in Ionia esse ἦια, ἦιε, ἦισαν, cum omnibus compositis. Nonne absurdum est igitur III 74 pro ἦισαν afferri ex libris: ἦσαν, ἦσαν, ἦμεσαν, ἦεσαν, ἰεσαν, ἴησαν, et εἰησαν? aut

VI 46 pro προσήκει scribi προσήκει, προσήκει, προσείη, et προσείη? Cobet then proceeds to discuss the merits of the three MSS and Stein's judgment on them. "A et B duo vetustissimi tam fideliter inter se conspirant etiam in minutioribus cum perexigua tantum discrepantia, ut constet inter omnes duos hos libros pro uno et eodem haberi posse: 'tanta sunt inter se similitudine ut fere unius instar sint, nec tamen tanta ut alter ex altero descriptus videatur' ut rectissime iudicat Stein. Miraberis autem in libris tam antiquis tam paucas bonas et veras scripturas reperiri." The number of corrupt passages in which these MSS present the true reading is, by Stein's admission, quite small. But their excellence, Stein says, consists in the fact "quod uni ex omnibus interpolatorum temeritate fere vacui manserunt, quod quale sit infra apparebit." As to the merits of R, the opinion of the earlier critics, which Stein confesses himself to have shared, was that they were very high. Stein has convinced himself now, however, that this MS has been greatly overrated: 'quidquid unus R offert id omne est aut correctum aut erratum.' The merits of this corrector, however, are praised in such high terms by Stein that "de Valckenario aut Bentleio aut Porsono agi putes." Cobet then proceeds to show how such different opinions can have been formed about the same codex. "Derivatus est enim ex libro antiquo emendatissime scripto et longe longeque fidelior et certior teste quam sunt A et B. Passim ille liber ipsam Herodoti manum solus servavit corruptam apud reliquos omnes. Ex illo codice fluxerunt per complures hominum aetates apographa permulta alia ex aliis propagata, quorum ultima ad nostram aetatem perdurarunt. . . Hi omnes in mendis et erroribus et lacunis ferme inter se conspirant. Optimum omnium et antiquius caeteris est Romanum exemplum." Cobet then gives a long list of manifest errors in R where A and B have the true reading. "In antiquo libro unde R propagatus est, versus erant litterarum 15-18. Deprehendit id potest III 54, ubi in R sic scriptum est: οἱ δὲ ἐπισπόμενοι ἐκτείνοντες Λακεδαιμονίων pro: οἱ δὲ ἐπισπόμενοι ἐκτείνον. εἰ μὲν νυν οἱ παρόντες Λακεδαιμονίων. Erat autem in vetusto codice. ΟΙΔΕΕΙΙΙ | ΣΙΟΜΕΝΟΙΕΚΤΕΙΝΟΝ | εἰ μὲν νυν οἱ παρόντες | ΤΕΣ ΛΑΚΕΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΩΝ, et scriba socors omisso versu tertio inepte coniunxit ἐπισπόμενοι ἐκτείνοντες Λακεδαιμονίων." To show why, notwithstanding these many errors, he still regards R as "unum omnium testem optimum," he says "utar in eam rem comparatione: duo antiqui libri sunt veluti duo senes, homines frugi et graves sed rustici et ingenii obtusioris. Contra Romanus adolescentis instar est, qui nobili loco natus et divitiis affluens liberius vivit vino et amori dans ludum, sed idem lepidus, urbanus, elegans, venustus homo. Is si forte temulentus est οὐδὲν ὕγιες loquitur, sed ubi se collegit et ad se rediit faceti ingenii est et iucundissimi sermonis. Quem modo audivimus meras nugas deblaterantem, idem permagnum numerum optimarum lectionum solus servat, quae tantam habent ἐνάργειαν, ut Stein ipse longe maximam earum partem ex solo R in textum receperit." Cobet then gives some instances of this, only one of which can be here quoted. In VI 128, Clisthenes tested the suitors for the hand of Agariste in various ways: "καὶ τὸ γε μέγιστον ἐν τῇ συνεστίῃ διεπειρᾶτο. Audi nunc Steinium: 'συνεστίῃ A: συνιστίῃ Bredovius, τῆσι ἰσθήσεσι L. Dindorf, ipse tentabam τῇ συνιστήσῃ ἐπειρᾶτο.' Sardi venales, alius alio nequior. Quid est igitur ab Herodoto scriptum? Id quod unice verum et in Vaticano codice solo servatum est: ἐν τῇ συνεστοῖ (συνεστοῖ). Dialectus Ionica et vetus Attica habebat nomen ἐστώ id est οὐσία, et ἀπεστώ pro ἀπουσία, et εἰεστώ pro

εὐδαιμονία et κακιστῶ pro δυστυχία et ἀεισετῶ pro αἰώνιος οὐσία, et sic συνεστῶ pro συνουσία, id est συναναστροφή, de hominum inter se usu et consuetudine . . . Ecquis ad hanc lucem serio credere poterit συνεστοί, quod nusquam alibi locorum comparet, ex Graeculi correctione esse natam?" In R the fifth book is wanting, the text of which is, however, the most correct of all. Why is this? "Non omnes habebant olim Herodotum *totum* (ut nec Romani Livium) sed circumferebantur codices, quibus aut singuli libri aut pars aliqua librorum contineretur. Sic factum est ut libri nostri non ex uno eodemque fonte omnes manaverint, sed alii ex aliis interdum melioribus interdum deterioribus sint descripti." The writer, therefore, of the original of R was probably unable to obtain a copy of Book V. It is notable also that in A and B, at the end of Books V, VIII, IX, there is a stichometric number. "In caeteris libris nulla est στιχομετρία. Cur? Quia libri V et VIII et IX ex alio libro quam reliqui desumpti sunt."

But little space is left for the two remaining articles. The first of them, pp. 414-23, is by I. C. Volgraff, entitled *Lanx Satura*. We have here conjectural emendations of certain passages. *E. g.* in Thuc. I 5, 2, we read that piracy was no discredit, even to some of the historian's contemporaries, οἷς κόσμος καλῶς τοῦτο δρᾶν. We are told to expunge καλῶς, as a marginal comment (cf. Cobet, N. L. p. 441), and the same remedy is to be applied in Isocr. IV 158. In Thuc. I 10, 2, τῆς δυνάμεως is to be omitted; in I 134, 4, οὐπερ τοὺς κακοῦργους is to be erased; and in III 82, 1, for ἐτοίμων we are to read ἐτόλμων. The last two have much probability. There is offered, besides an emendation of a fragment of Diphilus, one of Lucian's *δνειρος ἡ Ἀλεκτρυόν*, and several of Procopius *de bello Persico*.

The last article, pp. 424-48, is by Cobet on Julian. He commends in the highest terms the recent edition of Hertlein, whose only fault is that 'misellos libros nullius momenti aut pretii, . . . ut testes mendaces et corruptos, tamen producendos et audiendos esse censuit.' He should have regarded the *Vossianus* alone, which is at Cobet's side as he writes, and "tam anxia cura ab Editore excussus est ut nihil supersit agendum." In these notes there is not much of general interest. It is shown that Julian "immodicis laudibus extollit in coelum Constantium principem, minimi pretii hominem," speaking of his wife as γαμετῇ βασιλέως ἀνδρείου σώφρονος συνετοῦ δικαίου χρηστοῦ καὶ πρῶτον καὶ μεγαλοψύχου, "sed veros animi sensus aperit; ἀρ' οὐκ ὀνειδίζει μοι καὶ καταγελά τῆς μωρίας, ὅτι τὸν φονέα πατρός, ἀδελφῶν, ἀνεψιῶν, ἀπάσης ὡς ἔπος εἶπεν τῆς κοινῆς ἡμῶν ἐστίας καὶ συγγενείας τὸν δῆμον εἰς τοῦτο ἐθεράπευσα;" Several passages are referred to the originals from which they are copied. "Quidquid erat in Graecia hominum elegantiorum ut Homeri carmina sic Demosthenis orationes tenebant memoriter et statim agnoscebant si quis iis lepide et scite uteretur." We have, of course, many illustrations of the barbarisms which are to be left "Juliano cum sequioribus saepius sic peccanti," as ἀμαρτήσω for ἀμαρτήσομαι, παρὰ for ὑπὸ, μή for οὐ, etc.; and as to Julian's style in general, "quam sit Julianus loquax et verbosus δις καὶ τρις ταῦτ' εἰσάγων operae pretium est semel diligenter animadvertere." After giving examples of his garrulity ("quae est, ut libere dicam, μακρὰ καὶ διωλόγιος φλυνγία"), and a long list of synonyms "nulla elegantia cumulatorum," he concludes: "possem multo plura de genere hoc congerere, sed, ut Juliani verbis utar: τί πέρας ἡμῖν ἐσται τῶν λόγων εἰ ταῦτα μήπω σε πείθει;"

C. D. MORRIS.